UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/584,045	05/30/2000	Andrew Hausman	336001-2025.1	9896
20999 7590 04/13/2009 FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG			EXAMINER	
	ENUE- 10TH FL.		ROBINSON, KITO R	
NEW YORK, NY 10151			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3692	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/13/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/584,045	HAUSMAN, ANDREW	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KITO R. ROBINSON	3692	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailir earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 F	s action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro		
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 19 and 35 is/are pending in the appli 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-18, 20-34 & 36-40 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 7,19 and 35 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	is/are withdrawn from considerati	ion.	
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 01 April 2004 is/are: a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	a) accepted or b) objected to drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is objection	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documen 2. Certified copies of the priority documen 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documen application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list.	nts have been received. Its have been received in Applicationity documents have been received au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate	

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

- 1. This action is in reply to the restriction/election filed on 22 February 2008.
- 2. Claims 19 & 35 have been amended.
- 3. Claims 1-18, 20-34 & 36-40 have been canceled.
- 4. Claims 19 & 35 are currently pending and have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

6. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 based on Supreme Court precedent, and recent Federal Circuit decisions, a § 101 process must (1) be tied to a particular machine or apparatus or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing. Diamond v. Diehr, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); Parker v. Flook, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); Gottschalk v. Benson, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); Cochrane v. Deener, 94 U.S. 780,787-88 (1876). The process steps in claim (35) are not tied to a particular machine or apparatus nor do they execute a transformation. Thus, they are non-statutory.

('A process is...an act, or a series of acts, performed upon the subject-matter to be transformed and reduced to a different state or thing.'). A claimed process involving a fundamental principle that uses a particular machine or apparatus would not pre-empt uses of the principle that do not also use the specified machine or apparatus in the manner claimed. And a claimed process that transforms a particular article to a specified different state or thing by applying a fundamental principle would not pre-empt the use of the principle to transform any other article, to transform the same article but in a

manner not covered by the claim, or to do anything other than transform the specified article." (In re Bilski, 88 USPQ2d 1385, 1391 (Fed. Cir. 2008)).

The recitation of specific machine or particular transformation of specific article does not transform unpatentable principle into patentable process if recited machine or transformation constitutes mere 'insignificant post-solution activity.'" (*In re Bilski, 88 USPQ2d 1385, 1385 (Fed. Cir. 2008)*). Examples of insignificant post-solution activity include data gathering and outputting. Furthermore, the machine or transformation must impose meaningful limits on the scope of the method claims in order to pass the machine-or-transformation test.

The claims recite "displaying on a device" which constitute mere 'insignificant post-solution activity. Furthermore, the claims recite "automatically generating," however there is no clear tie to a machine or apparatus for this step.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 8. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Art Unit: 3692

 Claims 19 & 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sandhu et al. US 2003/0033212 A1, hereafter Sandhu in view of Potter et al. US Patent Number 5,787,402, hereafter Potter.

As per claim 19 & 35

Sandhu discloses:

- a plurality of user stations, each including at least one user computer, at least one input device
 and at least one display device (see at least the Abstract);
- at least one trade execution computer capable of executing forwards trades from forwards orders
 in the trading system, the at least one trade execution computer and the plurality of user stations
 communicating over a communications network (see at least the Abstract)
- a computer readable medium which stores computer programming executed by the at least one trade execution computer to cause the at least one trade execution computer to carry out a method means for executing a forwards spread trade (see at least paragraph 205) from the forwards orders in the trading system comprising a first leg forwards trade and a second leg forwards trade (see at least paragraph 0418, 0421 and 0422), and a price spread comprising the difference between prices of the first and second leg forwards trades,, the method carried out by the at least one trade execution computer comprising (see at least paragraph 0886)
- in response to a request entered by the at least one input device of a party at a user station to execute the automatically-generated order displayed on the at least one display device of that party, executing the forwards spread trade including executing among the party and two other parties the first leg forwards trade at the first price and the second leg forwards trade at the second price (see at least paragraph 192, 193, 202 & 205)

Sandhu does not disclose the following, however Potter does:

means-for automatically generating from the forwards orders in the trading system one of (a) a
forwards spread order including a spread price representing a difference between prices of
potential first and second leg forwards trades and an order relating to one of the first and second

Application/Control Number: 09/584,045 Page 5

Art Unit: 3692

leg forwards trades and (b) a forwards spread order, the automatically-generated order not being initiated by a party (see at least claim 25);

 causing the at least one display device of user stations to display the automatically-generated order (see at least figure 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to [combine/modify] the method of Sandhu with the technique of Potter because it is a quick and easy way to calculate the difference among the legs.

Art Unit: 3692

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should

be directed to KITO R. ROBINSON whose telephone number is (571)270-3921. The examiner can

normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Kambiz Abdi can be reached on (571) 272-6702. The fax phone number for the organization where this

application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from

either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC)

at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative

or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-

1000.

/Kito R Robinson/ Examiner, Art Unit 3692

08 April 2009

/Susanna M. Diaz/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3692